

mpu.
social.
Soe.
R

Richardson

Price 5 cents

Per Year 50c

WAYLAND'S MONTHLY

Entered as second-class mail matter,
Girard, Kansas, postoffice.

No. 37. Girard, Kan., May, 1903. J.A.Wayland

INTRODUCTION TO SOCIALISM

Single copies, 5 cents ; Twenty-five copies, 75 cents ;
One Hundred Copies, \$2.50 ; Five Hundred
copies, \$9.50 ; One Thousand
copies, \$18.00.

Order from Appeal to Reason, Girard, Kansas.

Communist **Manifesto.**

By Karl Marx and Frederick Engels.

The Communist League meeting at London in 1847, said: "It is high time that Communists should openly, in the face of the whole world, publish their views, their aims, their tendencies, and meet this nursery tale of the spectre of Communism with a Manifesto of the party itself." The two young revolutionists, Marx and Engels, were commissioned to draw up that Manifesto. They put their names to a paper, sufficient in itself to give them immortality. Between its beginning with those world repeated words, "The history of all heretofore existing society is the history of class struggles," and its closing with those familiar words,

*The proletarians have nothing to lose but
their chains. They have a world to win.
Workingmen of all countries unite.*

Between these two expressions on the lips of every Socialist, there is the tersest expression of the Socialist philosophy ever penned. 5c a copy; 25 for 75c; 100 for \$2.50.

Appeal to Reason,

GIRARD,



KANSAS

INTRODUCTION TO SOCIALISM

By N. A. RICHARDSON

Author of "Methods of Securing National Possession of Our Industries"

"You cannot get a thing without earning it unless someone earns it who does not get it."—ERNEST CROSBY.

Copyright, 1902, by N. A. Richardson.



PRESS OF APPEAL TO REASON
Girard, Kansas

PURPOSES OF THE WORK.

In this volume it is intended to state briefly and as clearly as the limited space will permit, some of the fundamental teachings of Socialism. If it can thus be told why we believe that our industrial growth or development is toward Socialism, why the establishment of a Co-operative Commonwealth will be the next stage in industrial evolution, what Socialism demands and how it may be brought about, the object for which the work is intended shall have been accomplished.

Often to each of us comes this question: What can you recommend as a sort of Socialistic primer for a person who knows nothing of our teachings; that is brief and not too technical; that will give him a general, though limited, knowledge of Socialism, and thus qualify him to read with a greater degree of understanding our periodicals and works on special phases of the subject?

Such a work is today the most crying necessity to our successful efforts as propagandists.

The author realizes the magnitude of the task he has undertaken; but he also realizes that it is a task that some one must successfully execute. The demand for such propaganda is imperative.

If this work fails to meet the requirements of the hour, it may triumph by inspiring some worthier advocate to complete success.

San Bernardino, Cal., July, 1902.

THE AUTHOR.

INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

The century just closed may be considered the first in the "Age of Machinery." Place the machinery of 1800 beside that of 1900, and the former sinks into insignificance. The great machines of today are mainly the product of nineteenth century thought.

But the "growth of machinery" is not spontaneous, and in rare cases indeed is the completion of a great machine an isolated accomplishment. It is stated by some one in a comparatively rude and simple form. This suggests to some other observer and thinker changes, or improvements, or total reconstruction; and this second product commonly meets the same fate as its predecessor.

Thus the machine that can do the work formerly done by two men suggests the one that can do the work of ten, and this, in turn, the one that can do the work of fifty, and so on, in some instances, to the one that can do more than could be done by a thousand men working as their ancestors of 1800 worked.

It was in this way that most of our great machines have been wrought, as the history of the nineteenth century bears witness. First, the small machine, then the greater, then the still greater and better, and so on until we reach the marvels of today.

But along with this development of machinery, this concentration of producing power, have come other changes that are its necessary concomitants, that must needs follow as doth the night the day.

The small machine was operated by the small capitalist, the greater machine demanded and, as we shall see later, produced the greater capitalist. The growth of the wealth of the capitalist has paralleled that of the machine and kept fully up to date. Certainly the contrast between the wealth of the capitalists of 1800 and those of 1900 is as striking as that between the machines of these dates. And we think this comparison will reveal about the same ratio for any decade of that century. Of course, we include in this comparison every labor-saving (or displacing) device as a machine, e. g., railways, steamboats, telegraphs and telephones, as well as reapers, looms, trip hammers and trusts.

Again, the small machine was operated in the small factory, the greater one in the greater factory, and the growth of the factory has kept pace with that of the machine and capitalist, until we now have the gigantic productive concern that is more typical of Teutonic civilization than is any other of our institutions, except it be a public school house.

And along with the development of the machine, the capitalist and the factory, has gone another change that we must not overlook—a change in the social and economic conditions and relations of individuals. In 1800 we were a nation of individual or indepen-

of their former proportions. Is not every element in the collective operation one of saving as well as safety?

Is not this combination a labor-saving (or displacing) machine? And yet there are men called statesmen who would force the combines to dissolve, force them to return to the old methods of guessing in darkness, force them to re-employ the now useless salesmen, agents and advertisers. Why? For the sake of giving men jobs. Ye powers! Is this American statesmanship? And yet that "argument" was heralded all over this land and operated with considerable effect even during a presidential election or two. Why not advocate the abolition of any other labor-saving device for the same reason? The Chinese do.

But can the combine be driven to the old method of doing things? Can it be driven from organization and safety to anarchy and bankruptcy? Not while there is left in America enough business ability to maintain and run a modern factory.

"Then," says the critic, "Socialism defends the trusts, does it?" Don't form your judgment too hastily. Socialists defend the "trust" method, the collective, co-operative method of production, but not the "trust" method of distributing that which is produced among those who do the producing. That is quite another question and will be considered in due time.

Socialists realize that the great movement that was inaugurated about twenty years ago, the formation of combines such as we have outlined and for the purposes indicated, was as necessary to industrial growth as was the great machine or the great factory; that industrial conditions, industrial development, forced them into existence; that they are as thoroughly a product of circumstances and environment as the immutable law of evolution has ever produced; that the question of how to deal with them does not admit the thought of their dissolution or destruction, but resolves itself into this: "Shall these mighty concerns be operated primarily for the benefit of a few owners or shall they be carried on on a much greater, more thorough and ever expanding scale for the benefit of the race of Man?" Like the railways, the telegraph, the trip hammer, the loom, the steam plow, the combined reaper and harvester, these great combines, or trusts or corporations (labor-saving "machines"), are here and here to stay, and the question is solely how to make the best use of them. They can be made a blessing or a curse. They can save our nation or sink it. Each alternative depends upon the purpose for which they are appropriated.

SOME RESULTS OF PRIVATE OWNERSHIP.

Under the capitalistic or wage system, the means, or, as we may call it, the "machinery of production," is operated as it always has

been and always will be—with the first and last consideration the benefit of the owners. A great factory, a mine, a bonanza farm or a trust in private hands is not a charitable institution. It is a business investment and used to augment the wealth of "those behind it." Any consideration that its owner or owners or operators may or should have for the public; any "good will toward men" or "spirit of fairness" that should influence the conduct of those financially interested, might form a subject for discussion even by a Rockefeller before his Sunday school class; but the consideration of such questions is foreign to the business world.

The machinery of production is a channel through which flows the wealth of the nation to the owners of the machinery and that is where it must ever go under this or any other system of production and distribution. It is well to keep this fact in mind, for certainly it is a very important fact. From it we conclude that if any individual, a number of individuals, or the public as a whole, seeks the best fruits, the greatest good from the operation of the means of production, he, or they, or it, must get into the line of ownership. We know of no other way to get the benefits.

Private ownership of the machinery of production has borne its fruits and the harvest is abundant. It has yielded on one branch a few millionaires, multi-millionaires and ambitions to become billionaires; on the other, a few million paupers and a good number of millions of wage slaves and hired men, women and children. It has amassed the wealth of states into the hands of single individuals and filled the sweat shops and houses of ill fame with those who should be numbered among the mothers of the nation. And we might go on with such antithesis indefinitely, but it is not necessary.

Private ownership of the means of production, or, as it is commonly called, capitalism, demands special legislation for protection of special interests or privileges of the private owners. This fact, this cause, if you please, has produced two important effects: First, the control, the domination of government by the propertied few; and second, a system (or many systems) of corruption that ramifies every vein of authority among men. The history of our city councils, city authorities, state legislatures, congresses, and even our judiciary, our political manipulations and elections, especially for the last fifty years, is, in large measure, a history of vile corruption, and the corruptor is a seeker after special privileges or immunities. "Money rules," as we commonly say, in summing up such matters, and in that fact lies one of two things or forces, that menace the life of our republic. The other will be the subject of our next consideration.

A FEW MUST OWN THE NATION.

The private ownership of the means of production, including necessarily, private employment of labor, capitalism, is rapidly amassing the wealth of our nation into few hands. Statistics are not necessary on this point; the fact as stated is patent to all. A small per cent of our citizens own the greater part of the nation already, and that per cent is growing less, and hence vastly more wealthy.

Now, this amassing of wealth into the hands of the few is, under the capitalist system, a condition that must obtain. Capitalism will force a few to own the nation. Let us see why this is true.

People commonly imagine that Mr. Morgan, Mr. Schwab and a few such men are paid vast salaries solely for organizing and running great combines of capital, entirely overlooking one of the most, in fact, the most, important functions that these financiers have to perform.

The work of a Morgan divides itself naturally into three parts. The first is organizing the great combines. This is the work of a master hand, and evidently that hand is upon it. The second is the running of the concern when formed; and so far as a Morgan is concerned, he, directly or personally, has little to do with it. The work is delegated to a series of subordinates, and Mr. Morgan's interference in any particular part of it would be as the interference of a general with the evolutions of a certain company. The third is as important, or even more important than the first, and is the one commonly overlooked.

Third, Mr. Morgan is now admittedly the head of a vast railway combine, the steel trust, the coal trust, etc. The annual dividends from these concerns mount into hundreds of millions of dollars! What must the owners of these millions do with them? Lay them away in a till to rot, or occasionally to look at? Spend them? The whole force could not spend a knot-hole in them. Is it not obvious to the most superficial mind that they cannot, dare not become idle capital; that these vast sums must be kept ever at work; that they must be invested in something as fast as accumulated? And this annual investment of these hundreds of millions—what a work for the financial genius! Reader, do you think you could do it wisely and well; or would you prefer to pay a Morgan a good, round salary to do it for you?

But there is another thought that right here forces itself upon us. These Morgans are compelled to purchase annually hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of our nation. Mark you, this is not an option with them; they are compelled by the simplest laws of business to do so. The question is not, "Shall we make investments of so much?" but it is solely, "What shall we purchase?" And this must be answered year after year.

Again, this amount that must be annually invested is each year augmented by dividends on all previous investments, and is a constantly and rapidly increasing quantity. And so it must continue until there is nothing left in which to invest. Then what? The system, like anything else that is false or wrong, followed to ultimate analysis or driven to ultimate consequences, destroys itself.

Hence, we repeat, the capitalist system compels the few to own the nation. (How foolish, then, to censure the rich for growing richer.) This is a fact that cannot be overthrown by any system of logic nor disguised by circumvention—a fact patent even to the proverbial wayfarer.

Let us, then, cease wondering at the rapid accumulation of industries under the sway of one man; at the crushing and absorption of small industries by great ones; at the acquisition of the steamship lines and street railways and steel rolling mills and all such things by the already syndicated railways, coal, steel, oil, etc., at the formation of great systems of wholesale houses and department stores, for the great investors are coming, must come, on down the line and enter even the retail business; at the acquisition of vast areas of the richest agricultural and grazing lands and the introduction of the steam plow, the combined harvester and thresher. It matters not what the occupation may be, it is rapidly coming into competition with the great machine, and the industrial world will soon have no more use for the small producer or small dealer in any line of business than it today has for the hand manufacturer of shoes, furniture or horse shoe nails. It is well nigh done with the two-horse plow and plodding plowman and the raising of stock where it must be fed from the product of toil for months every year. There is a cheaper way—and hence a better, more progressive way—to do things, than that used by our ancestors, or even by many of ourselves, and the improved progressive methods must displace all others. All this is simply industrial evolution and springs from a common cause—the invention and private ownership of machinery—as naturally as did the factory, the capitalist and the trust. The question is, "What are we going to do about it?" Let us discuss one more topic before answering the question directly.

THE EXPLOITING OF LABOR.

If any reader harbors the thought that he is going to get rich from the labor of his own hands, that is, by producing commodities himself or by working for a wage, it is an evidence of his youth and in experience. It will not require many years to dispel the illusion. In the legitimate business world there is but one way to amass a fortune—make men work for you and produce more than they are paid for producing, that is, by exploiting labor. If ten men do this for you, you will make some money; if a thousand, you will get

wealthy; if many thousands, you may become a multi-millionaire. Of course, the term, "legitimate business world," excludes the accident of mine location, inheritance, successful gambling, either with cards or stocks, etc.

For instance, we are told that the steel trust employs 125,000 men, and declares annual dividends of \$125,000,000. If so, that corporation nets from the product of the labor of each man annually \$1,000. When the Standard Oil Company employs 12,199 men and declares dividends of \$48,000,000, the labor of each of its employes must net the company \$4,000. Of course, great machinery and thorough division of labor—modern methods—alone make possible such a labor product. But this is the way the vast fortunes are accumulated. If I own the machinery of production—the means whereby men must live—if I, in other words, own the jobs, I am thereby vested with power to compel laborers to divide with me daily the product of their labor. And if they are in great numbers, or if, by the aid of machinery, their producing power is multiplied many times, my share of the "divide" becomes a vast fortune; and a fortune cannot come from the legitimate business world in any other way.

Ignorance used to contend that Socialists believed in "dividing up," though no Socialist ever lived who contended for such a thing. The fact is, the Socialists constitute the only party in the world that does not believe in "dividing up;" and it is because, and solely because, republicans, democrats, and all other capitalistic parties advocate and practice such division as we have already indicated, that Socialists are in the field to put an end to it. It is the dividing up process, absolutely essential to capitalism, that is putting the wealth of our nation into few hands. It is this process—the exploiting of labor—that converts the machinery of production into "a channel through which flows the weal of the nation to the few who own the machinery." This is the only way such wealth can possibly be acquired.

If I average to produce two dollars' worth and am paid but one dollar for producing it, I am yielding to some one a part of this nation; and as there are several millions of me, is it any wonder that the nation is rapidly passing into the hands of my exploiters? Certainly it is not, and it is equally certain that the only way to stop this transfer of the nation to the few is to stop the exploiting. The current of wealth must be turned from the few to the many. This can be done in one, and only one, way—the many must own and operate the machinery, the public must own collectively and operate collectively, every means of production, every exploiting medium.

A CHINESE OPINION.

When the armies of Europe and America were battering down the walls of Peking, the Chinese minister to England said in a period-

ical in substance this: "China does not want your machinery. Ages ago China tried machinery and learned that she must give up either it or the empire. She learned that it was amassing her wealth into few hands, destroying her institutions and menacing her national life, and she was forced to destroy it or it would destroy her." He thus summed up the cause, the effect and the remedy. But what a remedy!

It seems unaccountable that a man of intellect should not at once discern that if a few were permitted to own that machinery and operate it for profit—and, of course, private ownership would be impossible without profit—they must in time own the empire; that it was not the machinery that was destroying the empire, but the fact that it was used to enhance the possessions of its few owners—used as a medium through which to exploit labor; that if privately owned it must prove a collective curse; that if collectively owned and operated for the benefit of the collective body, it would have blessed the nation and saved countless ages of useless toil; that the question as to whether machinery should prove a blessing or a curse, resolves itself wholly into one of ownership. Strange, we say, that a man of intellect should not discern these things; and yet, although America today stands face to face with the same problem, how few of her people have thought out any better solution than that adopted by the Chinese.

"REMEDIES" PROPOSED.

One proposes to destroy the trusts—destroy co-operation of capital—destroy one of the greatest labor-saving devices of our age—destroy system and organization in business—destroy that which nullifies as far as anything can under the capitalistic system, the sources of danger to investors and to labor. Another, David B. Hill, for instance, suggests that the dividends on stock should be limited by law. That is, that instead of the great concerns acquiring, say, 5 per cent average of the nation annually so that it would take them twenty years to get it all, they should be restricted to 2½ per cent, so that acquisition may require forty years. He appears to think it all right for a few to ultimately own all—but not in his day. We think we have shown that the organization of capital is here to stay; that organization came because it had to come; that the talk of destroying it and re-establishing old methods is on a par with the Chinese solution of the whole machinery question. And as for Hill's "method," it solves nothing. To decrease profits—to reduce the degree of exploitation—is not only practically impossible in view of corrupting funds, capital-owned legislatures and congresses and courts and a thousand means for concealment of facts and evasions of punishments, but at best it could but postpone the inevitable. It is but a modification

of the cause, and consequently can but modify the present effect, leaving the final result unchanged.*

Again, President Roosevelt and some of his adherents propose compulsory publicity as a remedy. In speaking of the dividends of certain concerns, we have already given some statements that are specimens of voluntary publicity. Are not the annual, and even the quarterly, gains of many great combines, such as railways, steel trust, Standard Oil, etc., constantly paraded before the public? And what remedy does that work? Suppose every book of these concerns were open to the public and published monthly, what of it? Does the president think that if the public gazed upon these things it would move for a change? What change? Would such publicity lead to a demand for public—collective—ownership of the means of production? (And truly we think it would). But this is a solution that the president would not court. Or would it lead to the application of Mr. Hill's "remedy"—a demand for longer time for people to live on the to-be capitalists' earth? As we have said, there has already been much voluntary publicity regarding dividends, watering stocks, etc., but we have failed to discern any proportionate modification in the political conduct of men or parties.

"PROSECUTING" THE TRUSTS.

Our government is now bringing some of the great combines before the courts, and a great parade of these things is being made by republican periodicals and orators as evidence of a disposition on the part of the plaintiffs to control, to curb, these powerful concerns; to subject them to law; to defend the public against the piracy of combines of wealth; in short, as evidence of a lack of friendship between the republican party and organized wealth.

The railways, for instance, form a great combine, and the government proceeds to test the matter in the courts, as was recently the case. Now, the important point to first consider is, what is the nature of the complaint, what is the government's contention? Is it that one man or one corporation cannot buy and own all the railways in the nation if he or it is rich enough? Such a contention would but bring ridicule upon the plaintiff in any court in the civilized world—would be as foolish as to contend that one man cannot as legally buy a thousand stores as one store. The contention is that the bargain and sale of the roads is legally faulty. When they go to court one of two things must occur, and nothing else can. First, the combine may win, and in that occurrence the matter will remain as it is. Second, the government may win. Grant that it does so. The court then finds in favor of the plaintiff—finds that

*For a full discussion of this suggestion of Mr. Hill's, see "Methods of Acquiring National Possession of Our Industries," pages 25 and 26.

the bargain and sale is "irregular, for the following reasons." Every weak point in the contract is then elucidated. In short, the court tells the defendant, the combine, just what must be done in order that the bargain may withstand judicial scrutiny—tells the combiners just how to form the combine. The worst or best that the court can possibly do is to force the combiners to form a corporation as absolute as that of a national bank. Thus the government's action can result in absolutely nothing except to strengthen and not weaken the concern. And this strengthening can be quite easily accomplished by anti-trust laws and court decisions. The combines can be forced into legal corporations—into more thoroughly organized trusts than are now, in a few instances, formed. (Most of them are already corporations.) And then, what are you going to do about it? The trust makers can serenely repeat Mr. Vanderbilt's proverbial consignment of "the public."

MUST OWN PART OF THE NATION.

In May, of 1902, during the great coal miners' strike, the Springfield (Mass.), Republican, one of the ablest edited capitalist papers in the nation, after commenting on the fact that the government had not instituted any proceedings against the combinations of coal barons, said:

"Quite likely because the futility of such proceedings is recognized, the breaking up of the coal combination and the restoration of competitive operations are practically out of the question. The supply of anthracite coal is limited, and becoming more so every year. The railroad corporations, which own nearly the whole supply, are interlocked, to a large extent, through a common ownership, which cannot be broken up. There is but one way to deal with this monopoly, and that is the way railroad monopoly is to be dealt with—through public control or ownership."

This is practically an acknowledgement of the soundness of the contention of Socialism—that the only remedy for the capitalistic system is its absolute abolition through the collective ownership of the means of production. If the public must own the coal mines and the railways it must own the others means as well; for, as is evident to any student of industrial conditions, the ownership of these would rapidly force the ownership of the others.

Grant that the government should buy the railroads and coal mines. It would, according to this Republican, and according to all other "piece at a time" advocates of whatever political shade, pay for them in cash and bonds. Now, there are a vast number of people who are so thoughtless as to assume that such a thing would retire these captains of industry from the field of conquest. This is as foolish as to assume that a general who finds his position untenable and retreats in splendid order and condition from it, is conquered. Given the captains with their cash and bonds, can any fail to dis-

cern that they would then have more use for Messrs. Morgan and Schwab than now? Does anyone assume that they would lay that vast capital idly away? Or would they at once proceed to reinvest it? The latter conclusion is the only sane one; and thus fortified, what could they not conquer? One or more private monopolies may disappear by purchase, but only to force into being others even more menacing. For we must bear in mind that even the necessity for investments of dividends is forcing monopoly constantly, as we may say, nearer to the masses. Monopoly will naturally first take control of the nation's wholesale business before it displaces the retailer. This because of superior advantages, profits and convenience afforded by the former. But when the wholesale business is monopolized, the retaining function naturally follows. The one is as certainly doomed to monopoly as the other. It is with either a question of time. Would this time be lengthened or shortened by placing in the hands of the captains of industry the purchase price of one or more of our present vast concerns? The answer is too obvious to need formulation.

As monopoly "moves toward the masses," the number of small concerns displaced by it increases, and its oppressive work and methods become more widely apparent; just as the effect of any other labor-saving device is proportionate to the number of laborers who by it are forced to seek other fields of employment. And when system and organization, when collective methods, do for the retailer what they have already done for the independent laborer and the small manufacturer; and when they have done for the small farmer what they have already done for the concern that formerly carried his product to market, or for those that ground his flour or preserved his meats, a vast body of American voters will awaken to the fact that this economic question is a political question. They will also learn that as a political question it is of far greater moment than the manner of spelling the name of some political organization to which they have probably long been adherents.

We do not parade either present or future conditions as calamities. We are in no sense "calamity howlers." We, of course, realize that the institutions so rapidly evolved during the century just closed are working great wrongs and inflicting great suffering; but we also know that this is solely because we have not yet learned how to properly use them—how to direct the mighty forces that human ingenuity has enslaved—how to appropriate nature's resources and the result of inventive genius to the greatest good of the race. We still permit a privileged few to constitute the prime beneficiaries of all that civilization has accomplished. For this the laboring masses are responsible. If suffering is necessary to awaken them to a sense of this responsibility—and it certainly seems to be—then we must increasingly suffer until the day of awakening.

The world always has, does now and always will belong to those best qualified to own it. When the people of this nation have sufficient political intelligence to claim and own the nation their labor

has produced, they will claim it and own it. Not till then. To spread this intelligence is the work of the true benefactor of his race. And this work is now being carried on at a marvelous rate and will never cease until it is fully accomplished. This is what Senator Hanna realized when he said that the great political struggle of the future must be between republicanism (he should have said capitalism) and Socialism. This is what United States Labor Commissioner Carroll D. Wright felt when he proclaimed the inevitability of Socialism, and that the people had nothing to fear from the establishment of a Co-operative Commonwealth.

WHAT SHOULD WE PAY FOR COMMODITIES?

We are now ready to discuss a question whose answer reveals the very soul of Socialism as well as of capitalism. What should we pay for a commodity, say a hammer, a railway ticket from New York to San Francisco, or for a beefsteak?

Socialism says that we should pay the labor cost of its production; capitalism says that we should pay this and also a profit to the furnisher of raw material, the manufacturer, the wholesaler, often the jobber, the transporter and the retailer, and all others except the laborers, who may be concerned in getting a thing from nature's storehouse to a consumer.

The Socialist's answer means that one should pay for a commodity whatever he receives for the same quantity of labor that is in any way necessary to produce the commodity and place it within his reach. If the sum total of the elements of labor that enter into the cost make one day, he should give one day's work for it, and no more.

The labor cost does not consist simply of the labor directly spent upon the commodity; if it were so computed, no labor could be performed that was not directly productive of articles, as there could then be no surplus articles with which to pay for it. But the necessity of labor, and a great deal of labor, that cannot be directly productive, is apparent. New institutions must be constructed for the helpless, new railways must be built, machinery replaced, schools established and maintained, etc. So that if the absolute labor cost of an article is four days, one may be required to pay for it by five days' labor, the extra day going to pay all necessary but not directly productive labor; and this extra day constitutes as legitimate a part of the labor cost of the article as does any labor performed directly upon it. Of course, this extra per cent would be determined by experience and adjusted to the needs of the people. In speaking of the labor cost of an article, this entire cost is always meant unless otherwise specified.

Now, Socialists demand that when one does a day's labor he shall be given an evidence of labor performed, and this evidence he can exchange for anything on earth, the labor cost of which is one day.

This evidence of labor performed shall be simply a medium of exchange, a convenience, and may be in this form or that; it matters not, so that it is the most convenient and time-saving. Whatever form it takes it will be "money" redeemable in the products of labor; but it will not be a yellow relie of barbarism, for which thousands must sacrifice their lives in a frozen North and in every other well nigh uninhabitable part of the whole earth. How palpable the folly of gold hunting in the light of anything but capitalism. Under the Co-operative Commonwealth all the gold of earth would not buy a biscuit; nor would anything else except the evidence of labor performed.

Now, suppose one pays more for the hammer than its labor cost (as he does now), what results? A train of profits to useless exploiters, and finally, and not least, a steel trust, with hundreds of millions of annual dividends. For there is no other way possible for dividends to accrue from what the trusts have to sell.

Suppose that the labor cost of running a train carrying five hundred people from New York to San Francisco is one thousand days. If one pays more than two days' labor for this transportation between these points, as he now must, he is contributing to the dividends that make the railway trust so formidable that even a capitalistic editor (Springfield, Mass., Republican), admits that it must be suppressed by public ownership. The net earnings of these railways is equal to the revenue of a great nation, and every cent of it accrues from the payment they exact above the labor cost. Naught but omniscience could get these earning from any other source.

When one pays more than the labor cost for the beefsteak, he is contributing to the upbuilding of the meat trust, for this is the only source of its upbuilding.

As we have already said, when a laborer divides the product of his toil with a capitalist, he is giving away the nation to that capitalist; and as there are millions of the laborers, the capitalist must soon have it all under his exploiting hand. If the laborer would prevent this he must stop the exploiting—must abolish the profit system—and this he can do only by abolishing private ownership of the channel through which the profits flow—the machinery, or means of production.

ALL MUST WORK.

It is already evident to the reader that Socialism demands that each shall work or starve, since he must buy with the evidence of labor performed. (Of course, we refer here solely to the able-bodied. Those in any way incapacitated for labor must always live as they have always lived, from the labor of others.) As there will be no means for exploiting the labor of others, each is left absolutely self-

dependent. This condition is, of course, fundamental to the collective ownership and operation of the means of production.

Under private ownership the laborer is dependent upon the capitalist—the owner of the means whereby he lives—for an opportunity to make a living. And the only motive that actuates the capitalist—the only inducement for him to provide the laborer with a chance to live—lies in the prospect presented to the capitalist of successfully exploiting the laborer. When this prospect fails or becomes precarious, the laborer is locked out. He must look elsewhere for the means of a living. He may find it or he may not; that is no concern of anyone except himself and those dependent upon him. The collective body is under no obligation whatever to provide him an opportunity to live, and the capitalist is empowered to deprive him of that opportunity.

Under Socialism, the state, that is, the people collectively, demands that a laborer shall work or starve. Hence we recognize the right of the laborer to demand of the state an opportunity to work. Socialism would accomplish for the laborer, and for every human being, two things which we deem essential to his social and economic being. First, it would free him from the exploiter in every form—free him from dependence upon incorporated greed for a chance to live. Second, it would give to every one an equal opportunity, not only in the field of labor, not only “to make a living,” but to develop himself along any line where ambition might lead. Socialism can never remove the burden of discipline necessary to superiority in any field of human activity, but it can and must give to each an equal opportunity for development. Given the opportunity, if there are in any man or woman possibilities of superiority in any calling, development follows. Without the opportunity, the grave must put to rest many a “mute, inglorious Milton.” Lord Salisbury is quoted as saying that the son of a street sweeper has an equal chance with any other man to become England’s premier. In reply, it is but necessary to ask Lord Salisbury (as does Comrade Blatchford) if he thinks he would have been premier had his father been a street sweeper. Socialism, nor any other ism, can ever make people equal mentally, morally or physically, but it can and will give a chance to develop the best there is in each and all.

A DAY’S LABOR.

One should have for a day’s labor what a day’s labor produces. This is what is meant by the laborer having the whole of his product, or the equivalent of it. But what should constitute a day’s labor? So many hours’ work, but not necessarily the same number of hours per day for all sorts of toil; not, at least, under the conditions that will prevail when a Co-operative Commonwealth is first inaugurated. Adverse critics of Socialism often ask: “Un- the

system you propose, who would do the work in dust and heat?" "Who would perform the menial labor?" Ask such a critic: "If two hours constitute a day in the dust and heat and eight hours a day as a bookkeeper, which would you choose?" and the chances are a thousand to one that if he is a man of superior ability or is ambitious to develop along praiseworthy lines, he will choose the dust and heat.

It is a fact easily discernible that if our industrial organizations were thorough and complete—if we did everything with machinery that could possibly be done—if we produced entirely on the grand scale—if we eliminated every possible needless occupation—if we made universal the method now, at least partially, adopted by the trusts—if every able-bodied worker were put at really needful and productive toil for what now is an average day, we could, as a nation, produce several times our present product. And this means, as we shall later show, that at present at least three-fourths of our productive capacity is dissipated or wasted. It also means that we could produce as much as now by working about two and one-half or three hours per day. But we do not now produce nearly what the nation needs, even of necessities. Some years ago the author saw a computation showing that if regular army rations were issued to every man and woman in the United States, leaving out of the reckoning entirely the twenty-five or thirty millions of children, this nation, according to attainable reports, has never for a single year produced enough wheat or meat to supply what would thus be demanded. If this is true, evidently somebody's supply is seriously curtailed.

But suppose the average day is four hours, we could, we think, meet every necessary demand. Then by adjustment of the hours that should constitute a day in any particular sort of work in accordance with the supply and demand of those seeking that calling, we leave every man and woman absolutely free to choose an occupation in accordance with his or her liking. The only compulsion is that a choice must be made, as there will be no room for parasites. Such a thing as a tramp—that recent decoration that capitalism has placed upon civilization—would of necessity, disappear. His claim of inability to find work would be a self-evident falsehood and hunger would soon bring him to terms.

The idea that all products of labor would be turned into the common crib and everybody invited to help himself as he saw fit, is, to say the least, Utopian. It is not Socialism.

Again, it is evident that most of the menial labor—and this at its worst is but a small fraction of the sum total of labor—would be performed by the intellectual class on account of the shortened hours offered and the extra time thus afforded for self-improvement. The advantage of that condition is apparent. Put brain in this work, and a machine will be devised to do it. And the machine, instead of displacing laborers to their regret, and perhaps afflicting them with

inconvenience and suffering, would be hailed as a blessing that could but shorten the hours of toil for the whole people.

It is further evident that the sort of productive labor that a person performed in a Co-operative Commonwealth could in no wise affect his social standing. A laborer could not be a social outcast solely because he is a laborer, for society cannot ostracise itself. Each would have to partake of this curse or blessing—labor—and enjoy the good things of this world in accordance with the degree of his partaking. The part that a person acted as a producer would be an incident in his life, not as now, its determining factor. But what a person did while not at productive labor—the manner of spending his leisure time—this would, as it should, determine his position among men. Hence, in view of the different tastes, and the various degrees of ability and ambition among men, social, moral, mental or physical equality could not obtain; and even absolute economic equality would not, for the wants of some would exceed those of others, and they would be willing to do extra service to supply those wants. They certainly should be permitted to do so. Verily the “dead level of Socialism” is a myth.

LABOR'S REWARD UNDER SOCIALISM.

We have already shown that under Socialism commodities must sell at their labor cost, and we have explained what is meant by that term. Hence, if a person worked a day, he could then command the average product of a day's labor of any commodity. Likewise, if he worked a year, he could appropriate the product of 313 days' labor. Just what this would be when industry is thoroughly organized, its waste elements eliminated, machinery of greatest efficiency used wherever possible, and when the necessity of dividing with the capitalist and supporting a chain of parasites that reach from raw material through the factory to the consumer, is removed—just what would then be the average labor product of 313 days' work cannot be stated with absolute accuracy; but it would certainly be, counting days of nine or ten hours each, many times what is now paid to the average laborer. We have already shown that a day of such length would not be necessary; but we must sometimes use it in estimating the relation of the wages now paid to what would be the laborer's reward under the system we propose.

If four days' labor represents the labor cost of a high grade bicycle—and from practical experience the writer knows that would cover the cost—under Socialism four days' labor would purchase it. Its average cost now is easily five times that amount. Hence, in relation to this article, labor's reward under Socialism would be at least five times his wage under capitalism. In relation to sewing machines, the contrast is even greater than that; and here again the writer speaks from inside knowledge.

Carroll D. Wright is United States Labor Commissioner, and has

been for some years. As he is serving under a second republican administration, it cannot be presumed that he would color government reports for use in a Socialist campaign, even if he were disposed to color them for any purpose. His "Thirteenth Annual Report of the Commissioner of Labor," 2 Vols., can be procured (if the edition is not exhausted), simply by writing and asking him for it. Even a postal card will do, and it will come post paid. It is throughout a compilation of the labor cost of articles by both hand and machine processes. Note that labor cost, as used by Mr. Wright, does not include the additional per cent that must be added as heretofore explained, and hence his figures are a little low to strictly conform with our definition of that term.

From pages 25 and 94 of Vol. 1, we learn that 12-inch, 3-tine pitchforks are made by machinery operated by 20 persons, at the rate of one dozen in 9 minutes and 6 seconds, or the equivalent by one person in 3 hours and 2 minutes; which means that the labor cost of making one fork is less than 16 minutes; and labor receives therefore 4 2-3 cents, or 56 cents per dozen. To make the labor cost comply with our definition, add even 25 per cent, and we have 20 minutes as its cost. Then, even with a four-hour day, a laborer can earn three forks per hour, or 12 per day. Can you do it now? Yes, if your wages are about \$9 per day.

On the same page we learn that the labor time for one man to make one land-side plow, oak beam and handles, is 3 hours, 45 minutes, and his wages 79 cents (10 plows, \$7.90). Now add the extra per cent, reckon on the four-hour basis, and you still have almost one plow per day. How does that compare with the wages of the Pennsylvania miners, who last year, according to the state reports, averaged 79 cents per day,* while plows sold at about \$12 each? Would not the full product be better than a wage—of necessity but part of the product—at least, when measured in bicycles, sewing machines, forks and plows?

Same page, 14-tooth steel garden rakes. Reduce to one man one rake; labor time, 26 minutes, or less than 1-8 of a 4-hour day. How about "wages" reckoned in rakes? Labor now gets for making the rake less than 10 cents. He can now earn one in about half a day; under Socialism, he could earn it in about half an hour if we may trust Mr. Wright's figures. Reward, 10 to 1 in favor of Socialism. Perhaps you prefer capitalism—prefer to work from half a day to a day—the aforesaid miners could average about one per day—for the rake, and thus submit to a more vigorous raking than you will ever give your garden. Socialists do not.

Now let us consider one of the most important industries in the nation—the raising of wheat. Turn to pages 472-473, Vol. II. (bot-

*Average annual earnings \$218, or 79 cents per day for 313 days. Out of this was paid for rent \$36, powder \$14, oil \$5, company doctor \$6, leaving \$187 per year on which to live.

tom of pages), of this government report. Here we find a summary of every item of labor cost—human and animal—of raising wheat as it should be raised, on the grand scale and by aid of machinery.

The report is on a crop of 20,000 bushels, and the commissioner divides the total data by 1,000, giving the cost for 20 bushels.

Human labor 2 hours, 58 minutes (call it 3 hours). Animal labor (an item that we shall later see will soon be eliminated), 8 hours.

Twenty bushels for three hours' labor. Add 1-3 that it may more nearly conform with our definition of labor cost, and we have 20 bushels for four hours, or our assumed Socialist day. How many bushels can you now get for a 10-hour day?

And mark this, that this report includes every item of labor from the time men go forth to plow the ground until the wheat is sacked and stored in the granary.

But men do not go to this work with a single plow, a pair of bob-tailed mules and chain harness—do not go forth to wear themselves out plodding all day to turn over about one and one-half acres. They go with steam plows and steam threshers; they do the work as it should be done.

But you say: "This report is made on a basis of 20 bushels per acre, and land will not average that." Well, then, divide that by two and reckon but ten bushels per acre; and as the government's report covers the cost of operation on an acre of land, you still have 10 bushels for a Socialist day's work—for four hours' work—instead of, as now, about one and two-thirds bushels for 10 hours' work. In other words, even reckoning ten bushels per acre, your earnings under Socialism, measured in terms of this great staple, this great necessity, would be, when the hours per day are made equal, as they should be for just comparison, more than twelve times your capitalistic wage. A 10-hour day would then give you 25 bushels; it now gives you about one or two bushels. And if land will average more than ten bushels per acre, of course, the Socialist compensation is correspondingly increased.

If you have any fight to make on these figures, you must make it with the republican and not with the Socialist party. The republicans made them.

If any claim that the data furnished the government were "doctored" before reaching the labor department, we call his attention to another report on 20,000 bushels at the top of the same pages of the report, where less machinery was used, and the human labor expended for 20 bushels was 3 hours and 19 minutes, instead of 3 hours, as in the former case. It is not to be presumed that the parties furnishing the data got together and connived to deceive a United States official—conniving to hold him up to public ridicule.

The government, you will observe, reports the cost of human labor for the 20 bushels of wheat 72 cents (exactly 71.8 cents), in the first table cited, and 66 cents in the second case—a little over

3 cents per bushel.* For the cost of both human and animal labor add the last column on pages 472-473 and we get \$1.02 for 20 bushels, or 5 cents per bushel. Reckon on the seed—as it should be reckoned—at its cost of production, and the cost of producing the wheat is not changed to a degree worth mentioning. “But the sacks,” you say. Turn to pages 26 and 27, Vol. I., and learn that 500 larger than any used for wheat are even now made for from \$1.35 to \$2.33. Suppose that the raw material cost as much as to make the bags, or four times as much, if you prefer, and even then the cost of 10 sacks (2 bushels to sack). is not a burden—is about 10 to 20 cents.

Is it, therefore, any wonder that the flouring mill millionaires who can no longer invest their annual gains in mills, as they have all the mills needed, should turn the current of their investments in the direction of their own raw material? Anything surprising in that they should go to raising wheat instead of buying it? And when they get thoroughly into the business, as soon they must, what will become of the small farmer, the “Plodding Plowman” of Mr. Gray? He will simply “plod” into some other business. The world will have no more use for him as a wheat raiser than it now has for the hand-maker of chairs or for the stage coach. He will meet the fate inevitable of all small concerns.**

We cannot close this discussion of the production of wheat without quoting from an article in the *Youth's Companion* of April 11, 1901, page 187, from the pen of Mr. John Hyde, United States statistician of the Department of Agriculture. He says:

“The recent marvelous increase in agricultural production to

*See pages 24 and 25, Vol. I.

**Commenting upon the recent Irish Land Bill introduced in the British House of Commons, *The Times* (New York) questions the economic wisdom of the bill as follows: “It is more than a little strange that Great Britain should have waited, before making what looks like a sincere attempt to replace landlordism by peasant proprietorship in Ireland, until the economic and social wisdom of such a change has begun to be questioned and doubted. For scores and scores of years small landholdings have everywhere been praised as producing conditions theoretically desirable in any country, and even those who profited personally by the possession of extensive domains have admitted, more or less openly, that their position was only defensive. But now the situation is differently viewed by many observers, and the suggestion is openly offered that what may be called individual farming is neither beneficial to its practitioners nor advantageous to the state. The small farmer cannot use to their full extent the mechanical and scientific aids which the age has placed in the hands of the man or corporation that farms on a great scale, and yet the small farmer must sell his products in the open market in competition with the exploiters of tracts that are more like principalities than farms. He gets on the crops from a few acres the same percentage of profit as does he whose harvests are gathered in conditions that turn a minute fraction into an annual fortune. For much the same reason that factories have supplanted the little shops of other days, it is prophesied that the small farmer will soon be regarded as an anachronism. And it is at this time that Great Britain has made up her slow mind to try the experiment of peasant proprietorship! It is reform, but perhaps it is belated reform, with the circumstances demanding something quite different.”

which I referred at the beginning of this article has been made possible only by the general substitution of machinery for human and animal labor. The cost of the human labor expended in the production of a bushel of wheat has been reduced from seventeen and three-fourths cents to three and one-third cents; in the production of a bushel of corn from thirty-four and three-fourths cents to ten and one-half cents, and in that of a ton of hay from eighty-three and one-third cents to sixteen and one-fourth cents."

"The steam gang plow, with seeder and harrow combination, has done even more than this. It has reduced the time required of human labor, in plowing, sowing and harrowing, to produce a bushel of wheat, from thirty-two and four-fifths minutes to two and one-fifth minutes, and that required of animal labor from fifty-seven minutes to one and one-half minutes; the cost of such labor—human and animal combined—being reduced from four cents to **one cent a bushel.**

"That the inventive skill of the country will lead to still further devices to save labor and cheapen production, cannot be doubted. Not only will existing machinery be greatly improved, but new appliances will be brought into use, and mechanical agencies be employed for such operations of the farm as are still dependent on animal or manual labor.

"The economy with which an electric current can be conveyed from place to place, together with that prospective extension of rural trolley lines to which I shall presently refer, will undoubtedly establish electricity as the motive power for farm operations, and that without any considerable preliminary extension of the use of steam."

If a farmer of this country thinks that the private ownership and operation of the means of production—capitalism—is not going to "fix" him—if he imagines himself an independent landlord—he must indeed be a good republican or democrat.

Now turn to pages 36 and 37, Vol. I. Time spent in making, complete, a fine piano body, leather top buggy, 39 hours and 8 minutes—10 Socialist days. Add, say, one-half more for raw material, etc., and you get the buggy for 15 days' labor. Can you do it under capitalism? Yes, if you make \$9 or \$10 per day.

Standard platform road wagons, two movable seats, leather dashboard, corduroy trimmings, patent wheels; time of construction, 43 hours, or what would be 11 4-hour days. Can you now get one for 20 10-hour days? Yes, if your wages are about \$7 per day. Suppose we double the time on this article to cover the time cost of the raw material, transportation, wear of machinery, etc. This is certainly liberal. Then it would cost twenty-two 4-hour days. The reader well knows that the average laborer must now work from sixty to one hundred and fifty 10-hour days to get such a rig, as it would cost at retail about \$140. Labor now gets for making the wagon \$8.49, and to pay for it works about 1,000 hours, or 250 Socialist days. He would, under Socialism, work possibly 18 or 20 such

days at most. The determination of the relative earnings under the two systems is an easy matter so far as wagons are concerned.

What should an automobile cost? If you want it at such figures—if you want it on the basis of absolute justice, in a manner that robs nobody—you must vote for it.

We invite your attention to page 423, Vol. I, of our government's report. It tells us something about transportation of passengers by railway.

To carry 300 passengers 91 miles, requires 172 hours' labor, that is, 43 4-hour Socialist days. This means that one passage of 91 miles costs just one-seventh of a 4-hour day, or that a full 4-hour day would carry a passenger 637 miles. This 172 hours must include all the elements that enter into the labor cost, for the train crew alone would not consume but little over one-tenth of that time. The railway managers in this report acknowledge the total cost of running this train is \$39 09, or 43 cents per mile for carrying the whole 300 passengers. But all trains may not average so well, so let us suppose that the average labor cost is double that given here, a condition that in all human probability does not obtain, but suppose it so. Then for one 4-hour day you could ride, under a thorough Socialist system, 316 miles. You can now ride that far for one 10-hour day if your wages are about \$9 per day; If you get \$1 or \$2 per day, to pay for this ride you must work from 4 1-2 to 9 days of 10 hours each, or for from ten to twenty times as many hours as the Socialist system would demand. The question of earnings, measured in railway tickets, would be a strong argument in favor of Socialism, even if we doubled the double—if the average cost is actually four or five times that given in the report.

The reader is invited to examine the rest of that page of this government report and figure for himself on the labor cost of transporting freight, express and mail.

And thus we might go on, as the government has gone, through two volumes. It is not necessary. Sufficient has been said to demonstrate what Socialists mean when they contend that earnings under Socialism, even for a 4-hour day, would be far in excess of what they are now for a 10-hour day. The earnings measured in all things we have enumerated—and they are certainly fair samples—would buy what now costs about \$9. Is the reader ready to dispute it?

But these earnings can be realized only when articles are bought at their labor cost—as we have defined that term—when the exploiter is eliminated—when the vast non-producing, parasitic element of our population has been organized into a useful, productive force—when every element of capitalism has been eradicated—when people learn to make proper use of the ballot.

But more of this when we discuss the elements of waste in the present system.

MARKET.

The great struggle of the nations of the earth today is to obtain and hold commercial supremacy. Whether the armies are sent to South Africa, India, China, the Philippines or Afghanistan, it is market that they are sent after. Whether American capital of American armies invade foreign territory, market must constitute the spoils of victory. Market for what? For some thousands of millions of dollars worth (Depew says two thousand millions) of product of American labor that Americans cannot buy. Americans may need this product, and suffer and die for want of it, but they cannot buy it. Why? When laborers average to produce what must sell for two or more dollars, and get but one dollar for producing it, they are giving away a part of this nation—they are dividing up with an exploiter—and these thousands of millions worth of goods are but the first form of the gift, the first fruits of the division. The producer cannot buy the product, although assisted by all the non-producers.

An outlet must be found in foreign fields or the current will be dammed at its mouth, will overflow and deluge the producers; not, strange to say, in the luxury of abundance that their hands have produced, but in "stagnation and poverty" that must needs follow if they be permitted by capitalists to produce too much. If these goods fail to sell in a foreign market, the home market gluts, production must be checked or suspended, and likewise the revenues of the laborer; financial calculations are upset and a panic ensues. Thus, what should be a blessing—abundant production—and what would be so under a sane industrial system, becomes, under the capitalist system, a curse, the most serious menace to business stability, turns what ought to be the evidence of our prosperity into our industrial undoing, and the nation starves because it is so rich in resources, so abundantly able to feed itself. And all because the producer of the goods is not the owner thereof.

In the light of such facts, does not the system stand self-impeached? Is not this one product of the capitalist system—a crisis or panic—sufficient cause for its consignment to oblivion? Yea, sufficient to condemn ten thousand such systems in the minds of all except their chief beneficiaries. Is it to be wondered at that Socialism is growing the world over?

Yes, the United States, England, Germany, Russia and France are hysterical in their efforts to monopolize foreign markets. Every inch of available territory is a prize worthy of the construction of a world-conquering navy. And when these markets are exhausted, as they soon must be, what then? We repeat, "the system, like everything else that is false and wrong, followed to ultimate analysis or driven to ultimate consequences, destroys itself."

The measure of the masses of mankind who depend upon others for labor, as a market, is the wages paid them. When a few own the nation they must employ all the rest. When all are employes,

how will it be possible to sell goods at prices above their labor cost? To whom could they be sold? Capitalists well understand this self-destroying element of their system, and hence their herculean efforts to capture and control any territory that offers any real or possible temporary relief. "Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof."

WASTE OF COMPETITION.

This subject is too vast to deal with thoroughly in such a work as this; yet the author feels that it is necessary to touch upon some of the items briefly.

Under wastes we include all products of labor and all labor that thorough organization would abandon or abolish.

Railways paralleling other lines, often two or more lines where one would serve every needful purpose, are waste. Prof Ely tells us the cost of such useless lines is equal to that of the combined homes of the entire nation. Yet they all carry "water" enough to drown them.

Cities as now organized and run are but a mass of industrially useless humanity—a colony of parasites drawing its subsistence from the product of those who toil. If you live in one, you have the evidence of waste ever before you. Suppose that when your mail arrives your postmaster should dump the contents of the bags upon the floor, and each delivery clerk promiscuously fill his pouch and start out; several to A street and others to Z, and on the return trip, meet half a dozen going to possibly the homes that the returning ones have just left, and so on throughout the entire day and week and year. Would even a republican or democrat characterize such a method of doing business as anything but evidence of insanity? Certainly not; it would not be tolerated for an hour in any civilized community. And yet, have you observed the fact that the postoffice business—probably the only business in your town that savors of Socialism—is the only one in it that is not run in this perfectly insane manner? Are there a dozen or a thousand grocery stores in your city? Watch the drays delivering the freight and the grocers' few or thousands of delivery wagons scattering little parcels over the city. Do you discover any vein of industrial mental weakness in that, or are you too faithful to your party to desire to disturb such absurdities? You know that the street railway, the telephone and other modern conveniences render all these concerns except one, unnecessary. So does Mr. Morgan, and given a little longer lease of life he will personally demonstrate it. If he should go too soon, his immediate successor will complete the good work so well under way. Every dollar of needless rent, lights, insurance; every needless building, clerk, bookkeeper, manager or delivery outfit, and every hour of enforced idleness upon this useless mass represents a bill that the consumer pays. And mark well this fact, every bill that is paid on this earth, no matter what its form, nor by whom nor to

whom paid; no matter whether it be interest to a banker, a note to a money lender, a stock dividend, a government revenue, a princely salary, the expense of a Bradley-Martin ball, the price of a foreign title, rent to a land owner, a check for a Carnegie library, or a grocery bill—each and all are paid by the product of labor, are, in their last analysis, paid by those who toil. Can labor afford to dispense with any of these? We have grown so accustomed to this mass of almost total folly that we actually call it business and think it is so—till we get our eyes open, and then we give it its proper name, capitalism.

But the grocery business is not an exception. It is but representative of the "business methods" throughout your entire city. In the home town of the writer, 9,000 inhabitants, there are, within a radius of one hundred feet, six dry goods establishments and three more within two hundred yards. The bicycle business alone supports at least twelve families, his own being one of them. The community pays for our living without a murmur and calls it business. But the salary of an extra constable lashes the taxpayers into frenzy. Matters of such moment as one useless official are threshed over in our political campaigns and fought out in our state legislative halls. And we are just as sane and wise and economical as any other city in the land. Yes, and we have four daily newspapers, and four banks, and a goodly percent of our people are working for the latter. It might be suggested right here, though, that we can get along with one postoffice, one fire department, and one school system, just as well and conveniently as can Chicago or New York.

War and its equipments are another tremendous waste. Under a rational industrial system, it would be far better to deliberately burn the annual expenditure for support of this relic of barbarism than spend it as capitalism demands. Take from man the power to exploit his fellows and you remove all necessity and desire to kill them. Socialism would have no more use for live soldiers, as such, than capitalism has for dead ones. Under Socialism Europe would not tremble for fear of glutting the labor market should her armies disband.

The professions are a marked source of wasted labor. Tens of thousands of men who, if their energies and capabilities were properly directed, might be of real service to themselves and their fellows, drift into law, medicine, dentistry and the church, who are in no way fitted by nature or by education for such callings. And their service is as unnecessary as their qualification is defective. Capitalism breeds lawyers for the same reason that it breeds soldiers—because the whole system is little else than organized contention over private holdings. Eliminate the war producing elements—private ownership of the means of production and its corollary, the power to exploit—remove the cause and the effect must go with it.

From what we have already said, the labor wasted on small farms, like that wasted in small businesses, is apparent. And it is also apparent that both of these concerns are doomed, whether So-

cialism be attained or not. When those engaged in these useless pursuits are "thrown upon the world"—enter the labor market—whether their labor power shall be a blessing or a curse, like the labor power of a machine, will depend upon the use the nation can make of it. Capitalism may be able to kill off the surplus through war and starvation; but it certainly cannot provide a means of living for all. Or will the "surplus" vote capitalism into the bygone and use the earth for the benefit of the people who must live upon it?

Enforced idleness is another tremendous waste. Millions of men, women and children are constantly idle—useless, so far as concerns the doing of any necessary labor—whose labor power organization would appropriate, as it would all productive force. The whole nation swarms with this element—country as well as city. For instance, a fruit packing establishment started work in the San Joaquin Valley in California and called for some hundreds of laborers. Young men and women flocked into it in abundance, and the work of production proceeded on an immense scale. These workers were happy and contented, even though they worked twelve or fourteen hours for a pittance; they were qualifying themselves to buy some needed thing, and were willing, in their ignorance, to sacrifice many times its value to obtain it—probably an inherited disposition. Some vital condition went wrong and the thing closed its doors. These hundreds flocked back to their homes into enforced idleness. This instance could be paralleled anywhere at any time, and especially during the long months of summer vacation of our institutions of learning.

Another evidence of enforced idleness even among skilled and semi-skilled laborers is shown in the ability of great concerns to supply the places of strikers when permitted to do so undisturbed by sympathy for the strikers. Scabs are abundant, and there are thousands who could qualify as such but they do not prefer the calling.

Tramps we place under this head of waste. Now, do not get into a frenzy and declare that every man who wants work can find it, etc. While this may be absolutely true, it is also true that if every laborer were your ideal man—a good worker, a skilled workman, a man to send with a message to Garcia—your skilled laborers would suffer from hunger in the labor market. Suppose millions should qualify as school teachers. We could then get good teachers, but they would be cheap, and many a certificate would lapse from non-appropriation. The tramp; the opportunity to make a living without work; the possibility of gaining a livelihood from a small business; or to eke out an existence in some profession—these constitute four safety valves to the labor market. The inability, or a lack of opportunity or disposition on the part of workmen to become skilled laborers is the source of salvation, under capitalism, for skilled labor. Socialism would make them all skilled if possible—the more the better. A tramp can live under capitalism, hence we have him, and the labor market has naught to regret that he is a reality—that he

is not in the competitive field; and capitalism is as responsible for the tramp as for Bradley-Martin balls, dog teas and anarchists.

Enforced idleness is the most fruitful source of crime known to civilization; and capitalism is responsible for every hour of it, and hence for every crime that broods in the brain of the idler, because of idleness.

"All work and no play makes Jack a dull boy," though it may make him a good worker and an obedient slave; all play and no work makes him an insolent, indifferent, good-for-nothing. The two opposite conditions are as legitimately born of capitalism as are the trusts, the millionaires and the paupers. If we could witness what all work and no play is doing for children in America, we need but to visit the factories and the mines, the vast industrial institutions that are the boast of the American "patriot." Go look upon the tens of thousands of gaunt, superannuated forms of childhood, into whose life there never falls a ray of the sunlight of youth. A labor parade in one southern city is headed by twelve hundred children under 12 years of age, who through eleven or twelve hours of each day walk back and forth guarding the monotonous whirl of the loom.

We cannot here resist quoting a few paragraphs from Elbert Hubbard, author of the world-famous "Message to Garcia." Who can read them with unmoist eyes? He says:

"Many of the black slaves lived to a good old age, and they got a hearty enjoyment from life.

"The infant factory slaves of South Carolina can never develop into men and women. There are no mortality statistics; the mill owners baffle all attempts of the outside public to get at the facts, but my opinion is, that in many mills death sets the little prisoners free inside of four years. Beyond that he cannot hope to live, and this opinion is derived from careful observation, and interviews with skilled and experienced physicians who practice in the vicinity of the mills.

"Boys and girls from the age of six years and upwards are employed. They usually work from 6 o'clock in the morning till 7 at night. For four months in the year they go to work before daylight and they work until after dark.

"At noon I saw them squat on the floor and devour their food, which consisted mostly of corn bread and bacon. These weazened pigmies munched in silence, and they toppled over in sleep on the floor in all the abandon of babyhood. Very few wore shoes and stockings; dozens of the little girls of, say 7 years of age, wore only one garment, a linsey-woolsey dress. When it came time to go to work the foreman marched through the groups, shaking the sleepers, shouting in their ears, lifting them to their feet and, in a few instances, kicking the delinquents into wakefulness. The long afternoon had begun—from a quarter to 1 until 7 o'clock they worked without respite or rest.

"These toddlers I saw, for the most part, did only one thing—they watched the flying spindles on a frame twenty feet long, and

tied the broken threads. They could not sit at their tasks; back and forth they paced, watching with inanimate, dull look, the flying spindles. The roar of the machinery drowned every other sound—back and forth paced the baby toilers in their bare feet, and mended the broken threads. Two, three or four threads would break before they could patrol the twenty feet—the threads were always breaking.

"The noise and the constant looking at the flying wheels reduce nervous sensation in a few months to the minimum. The child does not think, he ceases to suffer—memory is as dead as hope; no more does he long for the green fields, the running streams, the freedom of the woods, and the companionship of all the wild, free things that run, climb, swim, fly or burrow. He does his work like an automaton; he is a part of the roaring machinery; memory is sealed, physical vitality is at such low ebb that he ceases to suffer. Nature puts a short limit on torture by sending insensibility. If you suffer, thank God—it is a sure sign you are alive."

And the capitalistic world wonders that anarchists should breed in such a nest.

Recent investigations have revealed even worse conditions than are here disclosed as prevailing in New York City and in various places in the east and north.

Will any of these slaves ever qualify for carrying a message to Garcia? Mr. Huntington or some other good moralist might go down there and start a Sunday school. He might say to those boys and girls: "You must be economical and industrious. You must ever strive to do our best. The fittest survive in the battles for life. You live in a country of vast opportunities and possibilities; a land of the free and the home of the brave. Every boy has before him the possibility of being president of this nation. Lincoln and Garfield were poor boys. You must ever be faithful to your employers; without them you might go hungry and naked through the world. Amen." And the good, loyal democratic politicians of South Carolina would applaud, and thereby get a job.

And all this wretchedness, suffering and murder that capitalists and their children may revel in luxury and idleness—all this that parasites may successfully plunder. Now three more thoughts from the same author.

"The overseer is not a bad man, but he has to make a report to the superintendent—there must be so much cloth made every day.

"The superintendent is not a bad man, but he has to make a daily report to the president of the company, and the president has to report to the stockholders.

"The stockholders live in Boston, and all they want is their dividends."

They live in Boston and seldom or never see those mills. Are they necessary to their operation? Do you now discern what Socialists mean when they say: "We need capital. That is simply the fruits of labor; and we are not so blind as to make war upon what

labor has produced. But we do not need these capitalists as such. They are parasites who suck the very blood of life from our children." And again: "We have more wisdom than to desire or try to destroy the life of the capitalist. What would it avail if they were all murdered and still is left in operation the system—the cause—that bred them? Would they not come again? Would not the same cause produce again the same effect? It is the system of capitalism—the power to exploit through the private ownership of these means of production—that we would and must destroy. This thing must cease to be. We know that the best way to destroy it is by ballots and not bullets; hence we urge all to help us end it in this manner."

The greatest blessing that can befall a man, woman or child is that which provides each with some useful thing to do each day and offers certain reward for its doing. But the contention that this "doing" should extend to ten or fifteen hours of continuous hard labor, thus disqualifying the laborer for anything but sleep or the grave, is an argument as barbarous as the system from which it sprung.

We want a laborer to feel his dependence upon the work of his own hands. We want him to feel that he has a vocation and a place to follow it—a condition as essential to his happiness as is a home and friends. This gives him "a place in the world." Then we would provide the laborer, that is, labor would provide itself, with places to spend its hours of recreation—the hours now spent so largely in producing dividends for parasites. And those places would not be dens of vice and crime, run solely for profit—solely for the purpose of further exploiting him. Nor would it be some council chamber where petitions are drawn begging some exploiter of his labor to let him live, or some Carnegie to play the philanthropist and "build him a library" from that which labor's own hands produced—petitions, supplemented by resolutions and constitutions forbidding him to profane the said chamber by discussion of questions of public policy—politics.

Labor would build its own libraries, gymnasiums, yachts, ball grounds, bowling alleys, theatres, music halls, lecture rooms, churches, and all else that would minister to education mentally, morally and physically, and would have time and opportunity, and hence disposition to use them and use them rightly.

INCENTIVES.

One of the stock arguments against Socialism, and one often indulged in by those who are presumed to be thoughtful, is, that its establishment would be followed by enervation of the race, in consequence of the removal of the incentive that impels men to accumulate riches. Or, in plain English, they argue that if the opportunity to acquire profits by exploiting labor; if the opportunity to

compel a laborer to pay the wage of two or more days' work for what his efforts, properly directed and aided by modern methods, can produce in from an hour to a day, it must needs result in enervation. This is a just statement of the position of these opponents because there is no other incentive, as we shall see, that Socialism could possibly remove.

This argument is a legitimate child of capitalism, which regards the accumulation of worldly goods as the chief end of man, the paramount issue of the race, the metre of success. No more hideous thought was ever bred in the brain of a savage.

In the first place, the desire to accumulate private fortunes is not and never has been and never can be the incentive that impels either men or nations to the highest, noblest or best achievements.

What individual fortunes did for the dead nations of history is a matter of hourly comment; but little indeed do we seem to profit by their experience. That like causes produce like effects is practically admitted in all things except practical economics. But facts are stubborn. That we can tread in safety the path that led the ancestral nations to their doom is a proposition too absurd to merit a formal denial. We are rapidly nearing the same precipice over which millions in fortunes and millions of slaves sent the ancient peoples, and if we do not call a halt, and that soon, we will land in the same boneyard.

"But," says one, "we all, or nearly all, want to call a halt. We don't want a few to get the earth." No, if you are not one of the few, of course you don't. "We want private ownership, but not so much of it." Yes, you want to touch off a cannon a little at a time. You want to leave the power and privilege of exploiting—for without this there could be no private ownership in our great concerns—you want to leave the machinery of production, the exploiting medium, in private hands, but you don't want the owner to use it for the very thing for which it is constructed. You don't want incorporated greed to run a mill in South Carolina rather than in Massachusetts because its owners can squeeze \$2,000 per week more out of your brothers' children down there than out of those in the North, and yet you admit that if you were in the business, that is just what you would do—that is, you admit it if you are truthful and wise. Perhaps you are a minister of the gospel of Christ, and **know** that you would not do such things. Let us prove to you that you would do worse. Hubbard further tells us:

"Capital is king, not cotton. But capital is blind and deaf to all that is not to its interest; it will not act while child labor means 10 per cent dividends on industrial stocks.

"Instead of abolishing child labor capital gives a lot near the mill property to any preacher who will build a church, and another lot for a parsonage, and then agrees to double the amount any denomination will raise for an edifice.

"Within a quarter of a mile of one cotton mill I counted seven churches completed or in process of erection, and that is the way the

mill owners capture the clergy." And every church has a preacher down there and every preacher is silenced on the subject of child labor because he is a capitalist chattel—silenced by a church, a parsonage and a salary. What would he not do for millions in dividends? Nor have we any right to assume that those ministers are any worse than we are. Their **incentive**, like that of the manager, the president and the stockholders, is to get worldly goods, and they don't see any other opening that is preferable to the one at hand. When such an incentive can stultify and corrupt (for practically that is what it does, though these are good men, as the world goes) workers in the immediate vineyard of Christ, why waste breath in prattling about righting such evils by installation of the spirit of Jesus? That spirit is incompatible with a labor system that puts a premium on every act that smells of hell. Capitalism despises such a spirit and seals the mouths of its priests—and seals them through the **incentive** that lies at its foundation—the **incentive for profit**, the **incentive** that corrupts councils, executives, legislators and judges and fills our congressional chambers with its slaves.

Now, go into the factories, the sweat shop, the brothel, the mines, the dens of the child laborers; go to the thousands of farmers of this country who are wasting their lives in toil for some banker; go to the million railway employes of this nation for whom the best possible in life is a living wage and the worst a place on the blacklist; go to the nine hundred and ninety-nine out of each thousand who are destined to toil, and moralize with them about glorious opportunities within their reach, the blessings of capitalism, privation and nine or ten hours per day labor. You may think you are doing missionary work. You are mistaken; you are canvassing with the proverbial gold brick. Your deception—where you can deceive—will be revealed as soon as the goods pass to the smelter. And the name of the smelter is Brief Experience.

In the whole history of the human race there is not one record of a praiseworthy achievement whose incentive was money-getting. Not a throne was ever worthily occupied; not an army was ever led to glorious victory; not a classic was ever sung or penned; not a monumental oration was ever delivered; not a statesman's power was ever wrought; not a true reform was ever worthily advocated—not one of these achievements is traceable to the incentive for accumulation of worldly goods. Not a worthy name in all history is there because of the ability of its possessor as a money-getter. Yet capitalism tells us—and tells it practically—that the financier, the man possessing this one marked quality of mind, though he may be the most sordid embodiment of selfishness and contemptibility, is the fittest and must survive—is the one best qualified to possess the earth and the fullness thereof—the man who should exploit the world. It is as false as it is hideous, and the voting Socialists of the nation will put the mark of Cain upon its accursed front and bid it into banishment.

We do not hold that wealth has played no part in civilizing the

world; that would be as foolish as to claim that war had had no part in the upbuilding of humanity. Both have been mighty elements of racial and individual environment—have been mighty forces in evolving that which is. Wealth, yea, individual ownership, is still the most potent factor in industrial evolution. It is the great captains of industry who control the countless millions—or, in other words, whose actions are controlled by their wealth, as we have shown—it is these men who are demonstrating, though unintentionally, to the world how it should run the business of the world. When President Roosevelt said to one of them: "It is such men as you who are responsible for the Socialist sentiment of this country," he came very nearly to speaking the truth. Not because they amassed great fortunes and excited envy and opposition does Socialist sentiment abound. If they could each and all emigrate and carry their wealth with them and thus settle all economic strife, we would bid them god-speed. Labor would soon replace the wealth, and, under the Socialist system, would not give it away. Socialists observe that capitalists forced to act along the regular lines of industrial evolution, have proved that organization, co-operation, thorough and complete, is the only possible outcome of present industrial conditions. Thus the coming Co-operative Commonwealth, far from being a Utopian fad, is "an historical discovery." Hence we would not harm the capitalist; we would but change the current of their energies. We would make of them public instead of private servants.

"But," says one, "these men might not be willing to work for the public." Experience totally disproves this claim. Many of them have gladly left a princely salary for \$8,000 per annum—and the honor and power of a cabinet position. Many more would like to do so. Some have paid even millions of dollars for a \$5,000 salary for six years—and a seat in the United States senate—though two such honors are within the gift even of little Rhode Island.

What, then, are the chief incentives that have made history?

The consciousness of ability to do certain things; the thirst for excellence; the joy born of effort; the approbation of one's fellows; a desire to benefit our fellow men—to leave the world better and wiser than we found it; ambition for leadership—for influence over the conduct of men; the undying fame and power of the truly great. These are the forces that have moved the world and that still control it. Wealth, like every other element of our environment—wealth, whether owned individually or collectively—can never do more than aid in directing them.

Under Socialism, not one of these forces, these praiseworthy incentives, is disturbed nor its influence decreased. Under capitalism, the influence over the conduct of men due to the possession of wealth, is the destroying devil of civilization.

As the demand for leadership, other things equal, is a constant quantity, under Socialism, that demand still obtains, but the corrupting power of private wealth is entirely removed—is rendered impossible.

Under Socialism business would be fully and thoroughly organized; education would include not only technical book knowledge, but a thorough training for industrial usefulness; high schools and universities would be multiplied many fold; the public lecturer would be a numerous functionary and have a vocation. Therefore, the call for leadership—thorough, excellent leadership—would far exceed anything that the world has yet known. A man of Tesla's genius would not be compelled to abandon his great possibilities and go and hire out* to a corporation in order to financially qualify for a few days work in his laboratory.

For an invention the inventor would be justly rewarded and not, as is now the case, compelled to sell his invention to some exploiter for whatever the purchaser sees fit to give him. A marked exception indeed, is the inventor who is financially qualified to put a work of genius into practical use, or even to prosecute in the courts a corporation that robs him of it.

If a person invented a machine that would save the labor of one or more men, he should be rewarded by the full product of one man's labor and given full and free access to a public laboratory and work shop, that his genius might have full sway. "But these things would be expensive," we hear. Well, if one cost \$100,000 or \$1,000,000, would not the money be better spent than for an expedition to the North Pole, or an appropriation of a few hundred millions to equip for the destruction of our brothers? We think so.

"Suppose this machine saves the labor of ten men, why not give him ten pensions?" asks some adherent of capitalism. He could not use it. What would he do with it? Give it to his uncles, his cousins and his aunts? Why should the public reward them? Is it because they are so conspicuous for never having done even a day's work in their lives, and so boastful of that fact? Give it to them solely because they are his uncles, his cousins and his aunts? That is the method of capitalism, and we want none of it.

When Huntington died, a part of what American labor had produced for him went to a foreign dude, who, so far as any argument is concerned, never produced a dollar's worth in his life, and who may never have seen America—went to him because he chanced to marry Mr. Huntington's adopted daughter.

Several millions of America's labor product went to a "French gentleman" by the name of Castellane—a fellow who would be disgraced by having to do an hour's work—because he sold himself to Mr. Gould as a son-in-law.

Senator Fair died a few years ago and after several years of lawing with his real or supposed or would-be wives, his vast fortune of over \$20,000,000 goes to his heirs. One of these who gets about \$7,000,000. is Mrs. Cornelius Vanderbilt, a woman who already has at her disposal more wealth than a thousand could spend, and who had about as much to do with the production of any of Fair's wealth as had the proverbial man in the moon.

Within the next twenty-five years, practically all the fortunes

of our rich, probably three-fourths of all the nation's wealth, will pass by inheritance to men and women who have played about the same part in its production as have the inhabitants of Mars.

Through what incentive will all this power be gained by the heirs? The very scientific advocates of capitalism may answer.

Should Theodore Roosevelt, Jr., become president at the close of his father's term solely because he is the son of his father? England (and some Americans) think so; and not many years ago a majority of our fathers were of the same opinion. A revolution cleared their minds upon that question. Another revolution that is now brooding—a peaceful one, we pray—will rid us of an idea that is duplicate of the one shot to death in 1776—will rid us of the idea that any product of labor, or any species of reward or distinction should pass to any being because of the accident of birth, or for any reason whatever except as a reward of personal merit.

Do you now comprehend how thoroughly individualistic is the Socialist method of collectivism?, and how thoroughly destructive of individual development, so far as the great mass of mankind is concerned, is the capitalistic ownership of the earth?

"But," you contend, "the inventor would not invent a second machine if the invention could bring him no further remuneration." We have shown that he could not use further remuneration unless he desired to squander it after the fashion of some of our American aristocracy, on an expensive and elaborate dinner for the dogs in his vicinity, or on a Bradley-Martin ball—functions about equally important to the well being of humanity. What, then, would induce him to invent another machine? The forces—incentives—that have made history, that now move the world and that must ever move it. No great inventor, dead or living, would, if he could, trade his place in history for all the gold of earth, and thus be deprived of all honor that attaches to his name. Nor would any other man conspicuous on history's page. When Napoleon had climbed the Alps and swept the enemy to destruction, he returned a hero. His wife entreated him to retire and enjoy his fame and fortune. He replied: "Bah, ten centuries from now half a page of history would tell my whole story." Genius works for the love of work, for the joy of contemplating something well done, for the approbation of mankind. Its stress is not relieved by achieving a half page; it seeks a volume or a library to record its triumphs. Never fear; the inventor would work. That is the way he would spend his "leisure time." And it would pay him and the world. Morgan has abundant to supply his every need should he live a thousand years, and he is now an old man. Why does he not retire in idleness—you say our inventor would? Because the more we achieve the more we seek of anything that adds to our influence or fame. Under Socialism private wealth can command nothing; work alone must win every prize.

It is certainly apparent that under Socialism, each must indeed be "the architect of his own fate." Socialism must remove the dread and fear of an exploiter's discharge or blacklist. It must give to

every human an equal right to live, and its corollary, equal access to the means whereby we live. But the struggles of life that are necessary to its proper and fullest development, it cannot remove, and "would not if it could."

"Then," says one, "I have labored all my life and accumulated ownership of a little farm. Socialism proposes to take it away from me." We answer: "My dear sir, under Socialism, we could not induce you to accept the little farm. What would you do with it? Do you think you could make a living from it and compete with the gigantic machinery that a Co-operative Commonwealth would muster in? Even under capitalism, what will it be worth to you when agricultural pursuits are Morganized as are many of the great industries already? What avail would be your ownership today of a small coal mine, or oil well, or steel plant, or railway, if you must operate it yourself and compete with organization? And yet coal mines, railways, etc., are run for vast profits. Under a Socialist state all would be operated at the labor cost. Would you want your little farm? Could you gain therefrom ten or twenty bushels of wheat for a four-hour day?"

"But I have a little home. You would take that?" "No, you would need that and could keep it, so long as you occupied it, for the cost of repairs and an annual payment that would replace the property in the number of years that equal the average life of such a structure—a fraction of what you now pay for taxes—an insurance rate below any that you have ever yet paid. Is that not fair? Is it not in accord with justice? The public would lose nothing in such a deal, and certainly you would be a winner." "But why should I not be permitted to leave it and rent it?" "An attempt to rent your property would again bring you into competition with the organized commonwealth, and the rent of a dozen such homes would not provide for one member of your family. Who would be so foolish as to pay you what is now called rent when he could get another home without any such payment? Furthermore, if you left your home and moved to another, would it not be simply equivalent to a trade? Would you lose anything?"

PRIVATE PROPERTY UNDER SOCIALISM.

Private property under a Co-operative Commonwealth would consist of anything that a person desired to own and was willing to work and pay for. It would necessarily consist of what we now call personal property and the right of exclusive occupation of buildings. Furniture, automobiles, bicycles, sets of tools—anything or sort of property except a means of production in which division of labor was utilized, and hence, laborers employed. Nor would it be at all necessary to exclude the latter by any legislative enactment. Such law would be superfluous. No need to enact that a person

"shall not own and operate a railway," would exist, because such a possession would be about as valuable as a dead dog.

The machinery of production is now a medium through which labor is exploited, that is, out of which profits are made. When every laborer has all desired opportunity to work and receives the full product as his reward, it would be impossible to profit by the labor of others, and hence impossible to profit from the operation of a railroad. Hence its private ownership would be worthless and consequently none would harbor any desire for such ownership—none would receive it as a gift.

The ownership of the right of occupancy is all the property anyone would want in any building and its grounds. If you "paid down" for a house you would be paying money that should come out of a generation or two after you are dead and you would be absolutely without insurance; because there would be no place for such a concern as an insurance company because no profits for it.

But there is another form of private property that you would possess, of which none could rob you and which no calamity except death could destroy—the inalienable right of free access to the means whereby you must live and absolute freedom from exploitation. To compute its value in gold coin, turn back and re-read the discussion "Reward of Labor Under Socialism," and decide for yourself what such a property would bring in the "pits" of today. Reckon your annual income as about 10 per cent of the property value and you will have its cash par in Wall street. How many in this nation possess such a property as under Socialism must fall to every being born into the world?

MISCELLANEOUS.

Saloons—Under Socialism, the saloon business as we now know it, as well as all other unnecessary institutions, would vanish along with the profits for which it is operated. The environments of life would be made such that evil habits and depraved appetites would rapidly be checked and soon disappear. There would exist a basis for the building up of a moral sentiment that would discountenance depravity and render social ostracism such a weapon as it can never be while capitalism obtains.

Corruption in Cities—Under Capitalistic sway, in every great city, influence over the conduct of men and immunity from the law are as marketable as are the necessities of life. Here "corruption wins far more than honesty." It pays—in gold—for one to sell and the other to buy. There is money in it—cash profits. And that is why there is corruption, and that is the only why. As long as capitalism rules—as long as the cause remains—corruption, the effect, must hold sway. When we purify our cities we will have overthrown the now hideous monster whose legitimate progeny menaces the world—capitalism. The struggle of the goodly intended to clean these befouled dens is, of course, commendable; but they

are laboring to cleanse a foul stream too vast for control and that is poisoned at its source.

Women—The complete woman—the woman who is living the life for which nature qualified her—the woman who is living the life that every true and thoroughly womanly woman is ambitious to live, is a mother and in her own home.

There are practically the same number of women in the world that there are men. It, therefore, follows that every tramp, every man the tenure of whose employment is so precarious that he feels that he dare not marry (certainly he is, in this condition, disqualified to marry) and his name is legion; every man who, from any cause, does not marry, means that some woman is destined to live a homeless and childless life—means, in Anglo-Saxon, an old maid.

Every woman who enters the labor market and by competition drives a man from what would otherwise be a regular source of revenue to him, aids in the disqualification of men to marry—is helping to dig her own matrimonial grave, and they are digging fast.

Every woman who works in a sweat shop; (In the Bulletin of Labor, May, 1896, Mr. Wright says: "But the evil (sweatshop) is so extensive and so difficult to reach that the ordinary factory inspectors are plainly unable to cope with it; about 160,000 persons are in the industry (clothing), of whom 70 per cent are on contract work, the only limit to their hours of work being the limit of endurance. No class of laborers is so desperately situated, owing to the difficulty of introducing reforms in the numerous small places abounding in the dark corners of the great cities, the helplessness of the victims, and the ignorant tenacity with which they cling to their tasks. It seems as though its victims are grasping at a chance to preserve life for the time being at any cost."); every woman driven into capitalistic slavery in a southern or a northern mill; every woman who toils at midnight that her dependents may not starve; every woman whom poverty and the wiles of a seducer landed in a house of ill fame, or what is better, a suicide's grave—every one owes her condition to a heartless, inhuman, organized greed, called capitalism.

Where, in all the range of vision, can be found a sadder picture than that of a young woman, poor and experienced, going out into the capitalistic hell known as the labor market to battle with the hardships and trials, the social alienation, the seductive influences, the temptations that shadow her every footstep? And capitalism paints such pictures by tens of thousands; paints a rapidly increasing number of them each year. They are upon the walls of the exchange; but the bulls and bears are not disturbed thereby. They hang in the halls of the exploiter; but the pangs of greed have rendered him insensible to their presence. They are reflected in the glittering gems in the social swirl; but they mar not its merriment.

The nations are awakening. They will sweep the demons of greed from the face of the earth. They will break the fetters of the wage slave and liberate the mothers and daughters of the world.

THE CLASS STRUGGLE.

The reader who has thoughtfully perused these pages is now aware, if he were not so already, that a world-wide struggle is on between two opposing forces. That struggle is fundamentally an industrial one. It will end in the determination of a new system of production and distribution for mankind.

On one side in the struggle is arrayed a body of persons relatively small in numbers, who are the chief beneficiaries of the established order or system of industry. These constitute the capitalist class—not necessarily the rich alone, for, properly speaking, it includes all who live wholly or in part from the labor of others—from exploited labor. This class is thoroughly entrenched behind all governmental authority, as, of necessity, the beneficiaries of any order must be. Their interest lies in maintaining things as they are—in the retention of the powers conferred upon them—in conservatism. Hence they are conservative. They well understand that their existence as a class—the retention of their power to exploit—depends upon control over the actions of those to whom governmental authority is delegated—the legislative, executive and judicial departments of organized society. They must control the delegates. This is a duty they never shirk, even though they must occasionally sacrifice an administration by one “grand old party” for one by another “grand old party” equally subservient.

Internal disputes, of course, arise over which of two particular policies is best calculated to contribute to their common interests, whether high tariff or tariff for revenue only, whether one monetary standard or two, whether reciprocity or a closed door, whether expansion or exclusiveness; but all these at most are merely reformatory measures. Nothing in them savors of a revolutionary character; nothing that even suggests aught that is fatal to the retention of their power to exploit the toilers.

That power cannot be removed by any strictly reformatory process. A reform can but change a system in some one or more of its aspects; but leaves the system intact; a revolution alone can abolish a system and build entirely anew. Unfortunately the American revolutions have overthrown the inheritance of governmental powers and a system of chattel slavery were each sanguinary in its final accomplishment; but it does not follow that all revolutions must so terminate.

On the other side is arrayed the toiling mass of mankind—those who live from a wage, from a part of what their labor produces—those who toil in the industries for wages—those now necessarily excluded from ownership in the means of production—those who live by sufferance of those whom they support—those universally denominated, though not in derision, the proletariat—the labor class.

The interests of these two classes are diametrically opposed. One is the exploiter and the other the exploited. The interests of the one are served—his dividends increased—by lowering wages;

the interests of the other are served—his income increased—by raising wages. And it is the friction between these opposite interests that has produced in this nation 23,000 strikes in twenty years—1880 to 1900—an average of three per day. More than 6,450 of these battles, whose average duration is twenty-four days, have been waged in the one state of New York.—Commissioner C. D. Wright, in *North American Review*.

The unguarded are misled by the specious argument that "contention between these parties cannot partake of a class nature because labor is dependent upon capital and capital upon labor."

Wealth is the stored or saved product of past labor. Capital is that part of wealth used in the production of more wealth and which is owned by one person and operated by another, or others.

Political economists include under wealth and capital as well, such things as the quality of voice and the training of a great singer, education, skill in labor, etc. It is evident from the discussion, "Private Property Under Socialism," that the establishment of a Co-operative Commonwealth would not affect nor be affected by private possession of any of these things, nor by private possession of such things as a kit of tools for a carpenter's own use, or any form of wealth through which labor cannot be exploited. We therefore use the word capital in conformity with our definition—as including only wealth used for the purpose of exploiting labor; wealth owned by one person and operated by others is production of wealth.

Labor, to be efficient, must use capital, just as capital, to be productive, must have labor applied to it. Hence efficient labor and productive capital are mutually dependent upon each other.

Now, with capital—the machinery of production—in private hands, two results follow about which an opponent of Socialism has little or nothing to say, because they reveal that which forces the class contention which we fain would conceal. First, the owner, the capitalist, stands between the laborer and the capital necessary to his existence, with power to exclude the laborer from the use of this essential thing.

Second, the absolute ownership of the capital authorizes the capitalist to compel the laborers to purchase access to the capital by yielding to the owner a part—and often the major part—of the resulting product; authorizes the capitalist to exploit the laborer; and finally authorizes the capitalist (or, as we have previously shown, compels him) to own the nation.

The enemies of Socialism have much to say about the mutuality of dependence of labor and capital; a dependence that no one disputes; but they have little to say of this dependence of labor upon capitalists and the dependence of capitalists upon labor.

Labor demands free and unqualified access to nature's resources; demands the privilege of using the earth as the natural heritage of humanity; demands the right to create enough wealth to meet every

requirement of the race and to own it when created. But between labor and the attainment of these demands stand the capitalists, the exploiters. They cry: "Stand aloof. You shall work when our best interests demand it. You shall produce only what we can dispose of at such prices and profits as we may determine. Production is not carried on for your benefit, but solely to augment our wealth and power. When it fails to accomplish this purpose, production must cease, though you go hungry. Our interests are allied to yours—when we need you. When we need you not, go your way."

No, there can be no "war between labor and capital;" but between laborers and capitalists the war is on and will cease only when the latter are entirely eliminated.

Years before a Continental Congress was assembled, there were those in America who felt and knew that the trouble between the mother country and her colonies would not, could not be settled by supplications to the king and petitions to parliament for redress of grievances. They knew that the final solution of the disputed question must remove the cause of the disputes—the determination of the ruling class of England to exploit America, and permit no American to have a voice in determining the degree of exploitation; that solution meant dissolution of England's power to tax, and that meant absolute extinction of England's power to rule.

These were revolutionary Whigs and naturally were hated and persecuted by those in authority—the beneficiaries of the established order—and those whom they could beguile into their way of thinking, the conservative people and the reformers—those who favored petition and supplication but who objected to injecting such questions into politics. Quite naturally, one here recalls the persistent action of certain labor organizations of our time, as well as that of unorganized laborers everywhere.

When Garrison was dragged through the streets of Boston for advocating a remedy for chattel slavery that would really remedy it, he and his followers were revolutionary, anti-slavery men. They felt and knew that the reformers, the conservatives—those who favored enactment of Missouri Compromises, Omnibus Bills, Kansas-Nebraska Bills, Squatter Sovereignty Measures and even secured Dred Scott decisions and enforced fugitive slave laws—were pursuing measures that must in the end prove of no avail.

They knew that the remedy for chattel slavery must remove the power to exploit a slave, just as we know that the remedy for wage slavery must remove the power to pay a wage and exploit the worker—just as we now know that strikes, injunctions, anti-Chinese bills, tariff regulations, eight-hour day laws and Civic Federations are but spasmodic efforts to ward off the inevitable. For reformatory measures must ever fail wherein the advancement of civilization calls for a revolution.

Many proletarians—laborers—have not yet learned that they are not capitalists, but they are learning rapidly. Seventy-nine cents a day will yet enlighten them in Pennsylvania, and like

causes will produce like effects elsewhere. The small producers, farmers and retailers who now count themselves as a sort of "middle class," when reduced by monopoly to the ranks of the proletaires, will also awaken—if they should sleep to such an hour. Many capitalists, as individuals, who perceive the inevitable outcome of this revolutionary, evolutionary movement, will join us. A number have done so already. But capitalists will never come to us as a body. It would be foolish to expect those in authority to voluntarily abdicate—as foolish as to seek succor for labor through the channels of a capitalistic party because it chances to write its name republican instead of democrat, or vice versa.

The united labor forces must take possession of all governmental authority by endowing with that authority only representatives of their interests. Then the occupation of the exploiter, like Othello's, will be gone.

There can be no compromise in this movement. Governmental powers will continue vested in the one class or the other. The exploiter will rule or disappear from among men. Reader, if you are satisfied with this rule; if you think that the best fruits of civilization are grown in his vineyard; if you believe that the conditions, the institutions and the attainments that now characterize the capitalistic world are subservient to man's best and highest interests, you will continue to vote for parties that do not advocate Socialism. If this is not the trend of your faith; if experience, observation and reason do not warrant this confidence, you will cast your lot with us and vote for the revolution that must needs be wrought. It is Socialism or Capitalism that shall be the industrial system of the world. You must vote for the one or the other.

Capitalist and Socialist Discipline.

By Ernest Untermann.

Many comrades, especially those who come from European countries and have gone through a period of military service, praise the high value of military discipline, and advise us to accustom ourselves to such discipline in the Socialist party.

The advice, though well meant, cannot be followed, and should not be accepted. The military discipline of the capitalist system is a perverted discipline. It is the result of the class interpretation given to the word discipline. The word, of Latin origin, means originally nothing else but "training." Under the rule of an exploiting class this meaning was defined as "training in the interest of the ruling class." It demands the enforced subordination of the individual will of the rank and file to the "authority" of the officers, the representatives of the ruling class. And the discipline of the old capitalist parties likewise requires the slavish submission of the voters to the dictates of the party boss. But as the old parties consist of capitalist leaders and working class voters, you can readily see that their discipline is nothing but a means of keeping the voters enslaved for the benefit of the wire-pullers and their capitalist backers.

Socialist discipline, on the other hand, is a training of the rank and file for their own interest. It is based on the voluntary co-operation of equals, who are actuated by the same principle, and striving for common aim. Contrary to the capitalist custom, the Socialist discipline aims to express the sentiments of the rank and file through the officers. This implies a voluntary acceptance of a position of trust, to be administered in harmony with the expressed wishes of the majority of the rank and file. A Socialist official is not the servant of a ruling class. Neither is he the servant of the public. He is a comrade and an equal. He has no "authority" over any body. Neither has the majority any authority over the minority. For the will of the majority in the Socialist party can never be used as a means to work injury to the minority, or to suppress their ideas.

The capitalists cannot get along without class discipline, because they need "authority" to overawe the majority who belong to the oppressed class. But in the Socialist party there are no class distinctions and no class antagonisms. A soldier-like discipline is, therefore, out of order in our ranks. We are all proletarians, either by necessity or by affiliation. Thus, we associate

as perfect equals, and our discipline rests on co-ordination, not on subordination. This follows quite naturally from the practical application of the initiative, referendum, and imperative mandate. For the practice of this principle requires the existence of independent minds, not of puppets.

Can an organization so constituted be something of which any American need be afraid? Does this look like anarchy, or like the "coming slavery?"

The Socialist party aims to practice in its own ranks the methods of the future society. We may still make many mistakes, and we may fall far short of the ideal which we are aiming to establish. Whatever shortcomings we may have, we are willing to acknowledge. But we recognize that we are learning better from day to day. The shortcomings that prevent us from rising to our ideal are survivals of the capitalist environment in which we have grown up. They are not due to Socialism. On the contrary, we are outgrowing them more and more, the better we understand Socialism.

From day to day we are learning better how to co-operate fraternally, and how to impress the new comers in our ranks with this lesson. Free speech, free criticism—which is not to be interpreted as meaning free flings at everybody—and free co-operation, form the basis of our new discipline, which recognizes no authority, because it is a self-discipline, not a class discipline.

Men leave the old parties to escape dictation and boss rule, and are often inclined to go to the other extreme and become anarchists. But there is a sane and healthy middle between the two extremes. We cannot find our way out of the capitalist labyrinth as long as we bow to the will of a master class. But neither can we escape from capitalism by anarchist individualism. The anarchist severs all bonds between the members of the working class and thus turns their strength into weakness. For the means by which deliverance can alone come is through the struggle of the working class against the capitalist class. As long as the capitalists act as a class, it is indispensable that the working men should also act as a class. To this end we need the voluntary renunciation of anarchist ideas about individual freedom and the self-conscious training in the Socialist co-operation.

The Socialist discipline, the training through the class struggle, alone produces that individuality which is destined to solve the pressing problems of the present period. To the capitalist motto, "Working men submit," to the anarchist motto, "Working men, individualize," we oppose the motto, "Working men, unite!" Under this motto we shall win.

Some Reasons Why Farmers Should Be Socialists

By William C. Green.

On the backs of the farmer rest all the toil and expense, all the losses from storms, drouth, frost, blights, birds, animals, insects, rust, boll weevil and every pest of nature and man.

After he has run the gauntlet of all these obstacles and comes to town with his product, a band of gamblers has fixed the price for him and he is forced to submit.

Then when he comes to purchase some of his products in a manufactured form, profits for railroads, factories, jobbers, retailers and middlemen galore have been heaped upon them and he must pay the price.

Socialism is the only salvation for the farmer; read this book and be convinced.

Price 5c a Copy, \$1 a 100, \$4 For 500

Appeal to Reason,

Girard, ✦ Kansas